



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Yuma Field Office

2555 East Gila Ridge Road

Yuma, AZ 85365

www.az.blm.gov



DETERMINATION OF NEPA ADEQUACY (DNA) FORM

DNA-AZ-320-2005-018

PROJECT NAME: Salt Grass plug transplantation

TECHNICAL REVIEW:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality	Roger Oyler		
	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Botanical, including T & E Species	Karen Reichhardt		
	Communications (Dispatch)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	Sandra Arnold		
	Energy Policy			
	Environmental Justice			
	Farm Lands (Prime or Unique)			
	Fire Management			
	Floodplain			
	Lands/Realty			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Land Law Examiner	Candy Holzer		
	Law Enforcement			
	Minerals			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Native American Religious Concerns	Sandra Arnold		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Non-Native Invasive Species	Jennifer Green		
	Operations			
	Recreation			
	Soils			
	Socioeconomic			
	Standards for Rangeland Health			
	Surface Protection			
	Visual Resources			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid	Stephen Fusilier		
	Water Rights			
	Water Quality, Drinking or Ground			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wetlands/Riparian Zones	Jennifer Green		
	Wild & Scenic Rivers			
	Wilderness			
	Wild Horses and Burros			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wildlife including T & E Species	David Repass		

Prepared by: _____
Joseph Colton, Resource specialist

Date: _____

Reviewed by: _____
Karen Reichhardt, Acting Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Date: _____

Reviewed by: _____
Lester Tisino, Fire Management Officer

Date: _____

Worksheet
Interim Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy
(DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management

Note: This Worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum entitled, "A Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy transmitting this Worksheet", and the "Guidelines for using the DNA Worksheet", located at the end of the worksheet.

A. Describe the Proposed Action

The salt grass collection area is located in, sec. 5; , sec. 8, T. 7 S., R. 21 W., Gila and Salt River Meridian, Yuma County, Arizona.

The Bureau of Land Management proposes to take salt grass plugs from the Mittry BAER area and replant them in the Mittry BAER area in another location.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

Yuma District Resource Management Plan Date Approved: **February, 1987.**

■ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Mittry Lake Salt grass plug collection is in conformance with the LUPs decision IH 2-1 which states that "Management practices maintain or promote sufficient vegetation to maintain, improve or restore riparian wetland functions of energy dissipation and functions appropriate to climate and landform.

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Mittry BAER EA # EA-AZ-050-2003-0039

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

The proposed actions impacts are less than that listed in EA-AZ-050-2003-0039 and is listed in and analyzed in the document as well.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

The range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents are appropriate with the Mittry Lake Salt grass plug collection, given current environmental concerns, interest, and resource values.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?

No new information or circumstances have arisen that would render the previous analyses inadequate.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

The previous methodology and analytical approaches used in the existing Mittry EA-AZ-050-2003-0039 are appropriate for the Mittry Lake Salt grass plug collection and coincide one with another. All site specific stipulations from Mittry EA-AZ-050-2003-0039 would be followed.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action have not changed substantially from those analyzed in the NEPA documents cited above. The previous NEPA analyses address the same site-specific impacts for Mittry Lake Salt grass plug collection.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

No new cumulative impacts would result beyond those previously addressed in the NEPA documents cited above.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

The public involvement and review process for the NEPA documents cited above is adequate for the proposed action.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Roger Oyler:	air quality
Karen Reichhardt:	Botanical + T&E
Sandra Arnold:	Cultural/Paleontology
Mike Behrens:	Fuels and Fire Management
Stephen Fusilier:	Hazardous Material

Jennifer Green:
Candy Holzer:
David Repass:

Invasive & Non-Native Spp
Land Law Examiner
Wildlife Threatened and Endangered Species

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan, and that the cited NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Approved by: _____ Date: _____
Thomas Zale
Yuma Field Manager

Categorical Exclusion Review

Department of the Interior Departmental Manual 516 2.3.A (3) provides for a review of the following categorical exclusion criteria to determine if exceptions apply to this project. The following exceptions apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (CX).

Environmental documents must be prepared for actions which may:

CRITERIA

1	Have significantly adverse effects on public health or safety.		
2	Have adverse effects on such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, parks, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or main drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains, or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks.	<u>YES</u> _____	<u>NO</u> _____X_____
3	Have highly controversial environmental impacts.		
4	Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.	_____	_____X_____
5	Establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.	_____	_____X_____
6	Be directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.		
7	Adversely affect properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.	_____	_____X_____
8	Adversely affect species listed or proposed for listing on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or adversely affect designated critical habitat for these species.	_____	_____X_____
9	Require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.	_____	_____X_____
10	Threaten to violate federal, state, local, or tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.	_____	_____X_____
		_____	_____X_____